[2nd November 1935

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Is the Hon. the Finance Member going to make any statement? "

* The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—" Sir, I would rather deprecate a vote of this House on these amendments. It is mainly a question of putting all the arguments of all sides of this House before the Government and the Hammond Committee and I venture to suggest to this Hon. House that voting will not be really helpful, but might rather confuse the matter. I would rather suggest to this Hon. House that there should be no voting at all. All the opinions expressed here will be placed before the Government and the Hammond Committee."

* Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—" I am at one with the Hon. the Finance Member on this point, because I feel that voting on such matters would really lead to impossible positions, because I know in the case of the White Paper there was an agreed resolution which I moved, but there were so many amendments and if you analyse the voting on such amendments you will find there was no real agreement at all. I hope that hon. Members will not press their amendments to a division and avoid this, as I feel the Government would know from the discussions that have taken place what the feeling of a particular Member or particular section of the House is on the various questions that have been put forward."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—" In view of the remarks of the Hon. the Finance Member and also those of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition I do not press my amendment."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Am I to take it that no other hon. Member is pressing his amendment?

" No other hon. Member is pressing his amendment; all the other amendments are, by leave, withdrawn."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—" May I say one word? I hope that these discussions will be sent to the Hammond Committee."

The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—" Yes, yes."

V.—THE MADRAS FOREST (AMENDMENT) BILL (BILL No. 22 OF 1935).

* The Hon. Sir K. V. REDDI NAYUDU:—" Sir, I beg to introduce the Bill [a] further to amend the Madras Forest Act (Bill No. 22 of 1935) and to move with the special leave of the House under Standing Order No. 39 (2) that it be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following 17 Members:—

1 Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.

2 ,, A. B. Shetty.

3 ,, Ahmed Miran Sahib.

4 Rao Bahadur P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated the 29th October 1935.

2nd November 1935] [Sir K. V. Reddi]

5 Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
6 ,, M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
7 ,, V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
8 Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
9 Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
10 Mr. C. Basu Dev.
11 Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
12 Rao Sahib D. V. Narasimhaswami.
13 Mr. G. R. Premayya.
14 ,, P. V. Krishnayya Choudari.
15 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai Pillai.
16 The Hon. the Raja of Bobbili.
17 The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu.

" Sir, the Bill is a very simple one and as hon. Members will find from the Statement of Objects and Reasons, in fact from the Bill itself, there is not much for me to say. The amendments are practically verbal alterations in three cases and only minor alterations in the remaining cases. For instance, in clause 2 we want the word ' Sub-Assistant Conservator ' to be removed and the word ' Extra Assistant Conservator ' substituted. The designation has been changed, but the functions of both are the same. As regards clause 3, it is only with reference to forests already established. When for the first time a forest has to be settled or demarcated, a good deal of procedure has been prescribed in the Act, such as notifications to the public and enquiries to be made as regards the claims that may be put forward, but when once this has been settled and declared to be a reserve forest, cases have occurred in which, for instance, the boundary line has changed, or a river had washed away a portion of the old boundary and under the description of the boundary, a new boundary might have come into existence. It may be that a tree or a building has been mentioned as a boundary on one side and it may be as a cause of dilapidation of that building or the destruction of that tree which no longer exists that this new boundary has come into existence. This clause is intended to re-define the boundary and therefore it is unnecessary to go into the whole procedure which had been previously gone through and about which there can possibly be no dispute.

" As regards clause 4, this has arisen on account of certain defects in section 32 which enables the Government to appoint one of the Estate Officers, where the estate has a forest, as the Forest Officer conferring on him all the powers which the Forest Act gives him. It has been found difficult to prevent cases of fraudulent removal of various produces. For instance, in various estates we have appointed the zamindar or the Dewan himself as the Forest Officer and he exercises the rights which have been conferred on the Forest Officer. But he cannot go on attending to the removal, say of small forest produce and according to the Act, as it stands, the watcher whom the zamindar

might appoint cannot stop the removal of these produces. That clause is intended to give power to the Government to appoint others, besides the zamindar or the Diwan, as officers with special limited powers.

4-15 p.m. " If we allow them under section 32, they will become Forest Officers under section 34 and they will be in a position to exercise all the powers given to Forest Officers. It is not the intention of the Government to empower them with all the powers of Forest Officers. At the same time it is our intention to give them limited powers, such as power to stop the removal of forest produce unauthorizedly. That is clause 4.

" As regards clause 5, it empowers Forest Officers to prevent the removal of forest produce by carts. The word used originally was carts. In the old time motor-cars were not thought of. But nowadays persons come in motor-cars and when they go back they take forest produce in cars. Therefore in order to prevent such things, the general word ' vehicle ' is used instead of the word ' cart.' Clause 6 is equally unimportant. It is intended for the purpose of protecting perishable goods. Under the present Act, the order as regards the selling of perishable goods should be given by a Magistrate. The power of directing the sale is vested only in the Magistrate. But cases have arisen in which there has not been time enough in which to take the case before a Magistrate and during the period the goods have perished. Power is now sought to be given so that in all cases in which it is not possible to go to a Magistrate, the perishable goods might be sold and the proceeds placed in the hands of the Magistrate so that he may deal with them according to law. That is all that is done here.

" At one time I thought it was not necessary to send the Bill to a Select Committee. But as I found that a number of hon. Members would like to have the matter settled before a Select Committee, I have myself moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee and I am sure that the House will pass the motion without any further discussion which may take place before the Select Committee."

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I second it."

* Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER :—" Mr. President, Sir, I would like to say a few words on the motion before the House. My object in giving notice of a motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee was this. Clause 3 refers to various sections. In the new section 17-A it is stated that it shall not be necessary to follow the procedure laid down in sections 4 to 16. It is all right when you have to alter the boundaries in minor matters in which the public are not concerned but what about it when you have to alter the boundaries in important cases? In such cases, the objections of the people in the surrounding areas should be heard and considered. That was why I wanted this Bill to be referred to a Select Committee where we could consider and introduce sufficient safeguards. I am glad that the Hon. the Law Member himself has referred the Bill to a Select Committee and I am thankful to him for it. I also want that before the Select Committee deals with this Bill, it may be

2nd November 1935] [Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder]

so arranged that the translations of this Bill is published in all the vernaculars and sufficient opportunity is given to the public to express their opinion. If there are any recognized forest associations their view point also may be taken."

The motion was put and carried.

VI.—THE MADRAS CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES (AMENDMENT) BILL (BILL No. 21 OF 1935).

. * The Hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Bill [a], (Bill No. 21 of 1935) and move that the Bill be taken into consideration at once.

" Sir, this is a very simple Bill. Under the section, as it stands, if a committee of a financing bank is to be superseded by the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, he could do so only with the concurrence of the Committee of the Central Provincial Bank. Administratively it has been found difficult, because the Committee of the Central Bank is largely composed of the representatives of the urban banks. Besides, there are certain banks which are not in any way connected with the Central Provincial Bank and consultation with it in superseding these Committees is hardly necessary. It is proposed to substitute the word ' consultation ' for the word "concurrence.' I am sure that the House will accept this Bill and pass it into law."

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I second it."

Diwan Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I am sorry that the Government have not given a fair chance to the Act which they themselves passed a year ago. So far as this provision is concerned, I believe the Hon. Minister remembers that it was introduced at the instance of the Government themselves in the Select Committee. That being the case, I do not see why the Government should be in such a hurry to amend it. I could see the logic of the thing in the case of the ordinary society if it was proposed to consult only the financing bank. But in the case of financing banks, they were convinced not very long ago that there should be the concurrence of the Provincial Bank for taking action under this section. Now, I will only say that there has not been sufficient experience to warrant the conclusion that this section is not going to be worked properly. It only seems to me that it is premature for the Government to bring in a Bill of this sort."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI :—" Sir, I feel that this is not a very simple measure as the Hon. Minister has described it to be. It takes away a lot of power which the Central Bank has been enjoying. The Act was passed only three years ago and sufficient experience has not been gained of its working. I know in one case they have some difficulty and that happens to be a bank in the district from which I come. I therefore support the Government Bill although I feel that

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 29th October 1935.